



**GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
OCTOBER 27, 2021 AT 6:00 PM
505 EAST 2600 NORTH
NORTH OGDEN, UT 84414**

PUBLIC CAN ATTEND IN PERSON OR:

Click the link to join the webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87994210998> Webinar ID: 879 9421 0998
Or Telephone Dial: 1 346 248 7799 or 1 669 900 9128 or 1 253 215 8782 or 1 312 626 6799

Welcome: Co-Chair Grant Protzman

Invocation or Thought & Pledge of Allegiance: Committee Member Julie Anderson

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Consideration to approve the September 22, 2021, General Plan Advisory Committee meeting minutes

ACTIVE AGENDA

2. Public Comments*
3. Discussion and/or action to consider Future Land Use Map
Presenter: Scott Hess, Planning Director
4. Committee/Staff/Mayor comments
5. Adjournment

****Please see notes regarding Public Comments rules and procedure***

Public Comments Rules and Procedure

- a. Time is made available for anyone in the audience to address the Committee.
- b. When a member of the audience addresses the Committee, they will state their name and address.
- c. Citizens will be asked to limit their remarks/questions to five (5) minutes each.
- d. The Mayor shall have discretion as to who will respond to a comment/question.
- e. In all cases the criteria for response will be that comments/questions must be pertinent to this Committee, that there are no argumentative questions and no personal attacks.
- f. Some comments/questions may have to wait for a response until the next Regular Committee Meeting.
- g. The Mayor will inform a citizen when he or she has used the allotted time.

The Committee at its discretion may rearrange the order of any item(s) on the agenda. Final action may be taken on any item on the agenda. In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodation (including auxiliary communicative aids and service) during the meeting should notify the City Recorder at 801-782-7211 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted within the North Ogden City limits on this 21st day of October, 2021 at North Ogden City Hall, on the City Hall Notice Board, on the Utah State Public Notice Website, and at <http://www.northogdencity.com> The 2021 meeting schedule was also provided to the Standard Examiner on December 12, 2020. Susan L. Nance, City Recorder

**GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
September 22, 2021**

The North Ogden General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting convened in a meeting on September 22, 2021 at 6:02 p.m. in the North Ogden City Municipal Building, 505 E. 2600 N. North Ogden, Utah. The meeting was also held virtually on Zoom. Notice of time, place and agenda of the meeting was furnished to each member of the General Plan Advisory Committee, posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on September 16, 2021. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on December 12, 2020.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Grant Protzman, Co-chairman	excused
Stefanie Casey, Co-chairman	
Julie Anderson	
Christina Watson	
Dan Nixon	
John Arrington	
Mark Brown	excused
Tim Billings	excused
Ryan Barker	
Phil Swanson	excused
Eric Thomas	excused

STAFF:

Jon Call	City Attorney/Manager
Scott Hess	Planning Director
Brandon Bell	Associate Planner
Kai Johnsen	Planning Tech

Co-chairman Casey called the meeting to order and Committee Member Arrington led the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. **Consideration to approve the August 25, 2021 General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting minutes**

Committee Member Dan Nixon made a motion to approve the August 25, 2021, General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting minutes as written. Committee Member Christina Watson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

ACTIVE AGENDA:

2. **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

3. **Future Land Use Map – Work Session Update and Amendments**
Presenter: Planning Director Scott Hess

Planning Director Hess began his presentation by referring to a color-coded map. He emphasized that the majority of the 2021 General Plan Future Land Use Map was recommended to remain consistent with the 2015 Plan. The 2015 Plan was well thought out and preserved the character of the existing community in many areas of the City, with highly desirable housing options, excellent access to open space, and productive commercial areas. There were, however, areas of change and opportunity within the community. The four key areas he described were: Residential Hillside Cluster, Urban Agricultural Protection Area, South Town Mixed Use, and the North Ogden Downtown Area.

Future Land Use Map Amendments:

1. North Ogden Downtown Area: Include properties that abut the North Ogden City Shops as well as the 5,000 square foot lots south of City Hall.
 - a. Zoning: RCC (with addition of duplexes), R-2, R-3, R-4
2. Remove the area along 200 E. from “North Ogden Downtown Area” as it is fully developed with large lot single-family homes. Retain the eastern rear portion of those lots as future growth area in North Ogden Downtown Area if residents determine it is in their best interest to combine and divide off portions of their existing lots.
3. North Ogden Downtown Area: Include undeveloped land west of Patriot Point from 2550 N to Montgomery Farms Subdivision.
 - a. Zoning: C-2, R-4, MPC (with mixed use)

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting September 22, 2021

4. Future Commercial Town Center – Focus on historic aspects to The Cannery and Kirt’s Drive-in. Redevelopment area could include mix of uses, daylighting Cold Creek, and creating a unique gathering place, urban open space, commercial entryway into the City.
 - a. Zoning: Future Mixed-Use Zone to permit housing along with walkable commercial
5. Weber County School District owned property changed to Civic/Institutional Use to reflect future school.
 - a. Zoning: Civic/Institutional
6. South Town Mixed Use: Include property around 1700 N to 1500 N, west of Washington Boulevard.
 - a. Zoning: C-2, R-4, MPC (with mixed use)
7. Potential future Commercial at Monroe Blvd. and 1700 N.
 - a. Zoning: Future Neighborhood Commercial
8. Potential future Commercial at Mountain Rd. and 1700 N.
 - a. Zoning: Future Neighborhood Commercial
9. Urban Agricultural Protection Area: Reduce the size of the “Potential Conservation Area” based on existing underlying land uses and developed park space which is not expected to change. Focus future potential on ways to preserve remaining open space through clustered subdivisions.
 - a. Zoning: RE-20, R-1-10 (with 30% land conservation)
 - b. Density Bonus Calculation Example:
 - i. 10-acre parcel at RE-20 (20,000 sq ft lots) = 21 lots
 - ii. 10-acre with 30% land preservation (7-acres remaining after preservation), apply R-10 zone as bonus density (10,000 sq ft lots) = 30 lots
 - iii. Determine character standards for preserved space / specific assets to preserve in addition to percentage preserved.
10. Potential future Commercial at Fruitland Dr. and 2100 N.
 - a. Zoning: Future Neighborhood Commercial
11. Residential Hillside Cluster: Retain underlying zoning but apply a density bonus for open space preservation.

- a. Zoning: HP-1, HP-2, HP-3, (Open Space Preservation: 25% density bonus for preservation of 25% of open space)
- b. Density Bonus Calculation:
 - i. 50-acre parcel at HP-3 (2-acre lots) = 25 lots
 - ii. 50-acre with 25% land reduction (37.5 remaining after preservation), apply 25% increase in density to base zone) = 31 lots (overall size of lots becomes 1.2 acres)

As each of these points was brought up, the Committee members discussed implications of each and asked questions. Some of the highlights of that discussion included the following points.

Planning Director Hess stressed that these were only recommendations, and not set in stone. He stated that one member of the public had expressed some interest in property north of downtown, which had informed some of these suggestions. In fact, the realities of developer requests and zoning change requests had fueled much of what he was proposing. He felt it was valuable to embrace some of these requests instead of ignoring them. He also pointed out that the previous map had a breakdown of land uses, but not zones. Land use didn't compare 1:1 to existing zoning. The changes he proposed were more open-ended, and were based on policies that had evolved.

Much of the discussion focused on whether or not the Committee was ready to recommend changes that could affect short-term development, when what they really favored was gradual change that would affect the development of North Ogden on a long-term basis, perhaps over the next 30 years. All seemed to agree that was a difficult task. For example, there were agricultural lands that people felt strongly about today, but people of the future might not feel so passionately about them. They seemed to favor a form of buffering, which included (in residential density) a reduction in single family dwellings and an increase in duplexes. Duplexes seemed to represent a gradual transition to higher density. Townhomes were not as desirable.

The Committee was deferential to the needs and desires of current property owners and wondered how these proposed changes would be met by the public. In most cases, they felt they would be supportive, though some would certainly speak out against them. What they didn't want to have happen was a policy change that forced current property owners to sell because they didn't like the changes. Committee Member Watson pointed out that they were not the Planning Commission, rather just an advisory committee—and it was not their job to listen to all comments and complaints, rather, that was the City Council's job.

Co-chairman Casey asked if they would be discussing broadening the downtown area if someone hadn't pushed for changes. She pointed out that it may be a 30-year proposal, but things could take off immediately. She did not like the idea of causing harm to the neighbors. On the other hand, if they proposed increased density with better design standards, the community might go for it.

There were several areas on the map that the Committee felt were logical buffer zones and could handle increased density right away, if that's what happened. One of those areas was by the cemetery. Planning Director Hess stated they needed to be able to identify that somehow on the map. He felt that it could be a land use category supported by underlying zones, though he wasn't sure that created the desired buffer.

City Manager/Attorney Call pointed out that a traffic light was scheduled to go in on one of the key roadways, which could propel commercial development in that area. Co-chairman Casey suggested that soft-use commercial, such as a coffee shop, would likely do better in such a location than town homes. She felt that development such as that could happen organically with the right overlay zoning. She favored a proposal that left firm options to be decided by the City Council.

They shifted their focus to the development of a future commercial town center. There was a lot of development opportunity in that, and the focus could be on the historic aspects of downtown. Urban open space was discussed, as well as the commercial entry into the City. They could hire a consultant to help them think it through, and apply for funding. The recommendation would likely be a future mixed use zone that they didn't even have a zone for on today's books. Planning Director Hess commented that there had already been some work to create a walkable zone, and that they had some really good historical documents to lean on to bring that discussion back up.

They all agreed that transition, and how to make that go smoothly, was the hardest part. The need for a park was brought up. Planning Director Hess pointed out that the City could buy property that was well-suited for a park. Also mentioned was the City's pond, which was one of the biggest regional detention basins. The fish farm was brought up as an example of something the public liked (because it leaned on the heritage of the community) but which could never get approved today.

The area on Monroe Boulevard, which was predicted to expand in population from 20,000 to 40,000 over 30 years' time, would move people out—so it could transition to more businesses. That kind of transition would be quiet, and easy to live with. Commercial development would occur naturally where there was the right transportation and people. Those two things created opportunity for a centered development. Co-chairman Casey stated that she liked the idea of neighborhood-supported businesses. She suggested that "Neighborhood Commercial," as a zone, should be very specifically defined. That way, multiple ideas could come in for discussion and consideration.

Other collector streets were noted and discussed. Planning Director Hess suggested marking areas on the map where parks could potentially go. A mobile home park was discussed as an area that could be turned over to higher density housing.

Committee Member Casey was especially hesitant to decide on something that would limit future possibilities. She referenced an old little rock building that had been turned into a boutique. What if sometime in the future, a farmer decided to upgrade his barn for such a purpose? She would hate for that discussion not to happen because they had defined only

certain spaces. Committee Member Watson suggested that the Neighborhood Commercial overlay would have to be on many places in the City. Casey agreed, and she wanted those discussions to happen. Planning Director Hess, in support of Watson's and Casey's points, stated that a developer might see opportunity at any corner in the City.

City Manager/Attorney Call noted that spot zoning was no longer illegal.

Planning Director Hess suggested iconic landmarks should be considered in all of this. He gave the example of a farmer in Hyde Park who decided to convert his farm property to a winery and used a barn for an events space.

In the discussion for Area 9, Planning Director Hess noted that this area was fully developed, with very limited area for conservation. He posed the question to the group as to what they thought conservation actually meant. He pointed out that Northwood Hills was a great subdivision, but there was no conservation in it. He had looked at the City's few different conservation ordinances. He suggested a plan that if they required 30% conservation from a developer, they could double the density of the remaining 70% of space. He had spoken to three different developers who thought the plan was reasonable. He gave an example from the City of Farmington, which by this method had accumulated \$800,000 which they used for a major regional park on property they had previously identified. Committee Member Watson asked if this plan was only for Area 9, or could it apply all over the City. Planning Director Hess stated it would apply everywhere. As Committee Member Watson was very conservation-minded, favoring as many parks as possible, she hoped that could be put into place sooner than later.

Co-Chairman Casey suggested that as they contemplated higher density, establishing greater setbacks from property lines would be a key consideration. She pointed out that as density went up, so would the height of homes and that could be a problem for neighbors. She cited some difficult situations where fill dirt had been piled against fences, which could be the outcome of developing on hills.

The discussion kept coming back to the issue of parks. Just because something was "green" didn't mean it was a park in the usual sense. Some green grass was restricted, and the City or an HOA had to maintain green space. The City might accept some space for future park use, but might not be able to afford to develop it immediately. Committee Member Anderson stated she thought there was a Federal mandate for the amount of park space a City should have. City Manager/Attorney Call was unaware of anything of that nature, and suggested that if anyone found a reference to that, please send him a link.

Planning Director Hess stated that the City could collect small pieces of conserved space bit by bit, and then combine them for one larger park. He felt it was important to accept the land as it became available. Furthermore, smaller parks were desirable for neighborhoods, whose residents might otherwise have to load up in the car to drive to a larger park some distance from their homes.

The work session concluded with a discussion about hillside development. An alluvial fan in the hillside area was probably a fault line, according to engineers. If development took place it would likely be super-expensive town homes. Hillside development was typically the most expensive real estate. Co-chairman Casey stated she did not like that kind of development.

An inquiry was made about a yellow line on the map, asking what that meant. Planning Director Call stated that was the boundary past which the City could not provide services. In a way, that could be considered a form of conservation (if the City owned it), or a property owner could consider asking for annexation. The County could not provide sewer without a City. City Manager/Attorney Call joked that they might all be retired before certain hillside areas were developed. He acknowledged that slope determines develop-ability, and that sometimes Cities make mistakes on hillside developments.

Co-chairman Casey asked about the Long Bench area, stating there were a lot of people concerned about someone trying to build on it. City Manager/Attorney Call stated there had been a development agreement in place for that area since 2000, though it contained no specifics on housing.

Planning Director Hess wrapped the meeting up by admitting a lot of information had been discussed. He asked that if there were other ideas that they be sent to him. He committed to making appropriate changes to his proposal and bringing it back to the next meeting, at which time they could work further to determine the parameters of a Neighborhood Commercial Zone.

4. **Committee/Commissioners/Staff/Mayor comments**

There were no additional comments.

5. **Adjournment**

Committee Co-chairman Stefanie Casey made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Committee Member John Arrington seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

Grant Protzman, Co-chairman

Joyce Pierson, Deputy City Recorder

Date Approved

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting September 22, 2021

Staff Report to the General Plan Advisory Committee

SYNOPSIS / APPLICATION INFORMATION

Application Request:	Discussion Item: Report to the General Plan Advisory Committee
Agenda Date:	October 27, 2021
Applicant:	Planning Department Staff
File Number:	N/A

STAFF INFORMATION

Scott A. Hess
shess@nogden.org
(801) 737-9841

BACKGROUND

The General Plan Advisory Committee and the North Ogden Planning Commission met together on September 22, 2021, to review proposed amendments to the General Plan Future Land Use Map. The Committee provided specific direction to Staff on land uses and boundaries of the identified areas of change. The attached map, DRAFT 2021 General Plan Future Land Use Map (see Attachment A), includes those comments along with a numbered description of recommended amendments in this staff report below.

Staff would like to reiterate that the majority of the 2021 General Plan Future Land Use Map is recommended to remain consistent with the 2015 Plan. The 2015 Plan is well thought out and preserves the character of the existing community in many areas of the city, with highly desirable housing options, excellent access to open space, and productive commercial areas. There are however areas of change and opportunity within the community. These four key areas are: Residential Hillside Cluster, Urban Agricultural Protection Area, South Town Mixed Use, and the North Ogden Downtown Area.

It is Staff's request that the General Plan Advisory Committee review the attached map, and come to the meeting prepared to make a recommendation for consideration of this map by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Future Land Use Map Amendments:

1. North Ogden Downtown Area: Include properties that abut the North Ogden City Shops as well as the 5,000 square foot lots south of City Hall.

- a. Zoning: RCC (with addition of Twin Homes), R-2, R-3, R-4, R-1-5
- 1A. Twin Home Overlay from 2750 N. and 450 E. running north to Ben Lomond Cemetery.
- a. Zoning: RCC (with addition of Twin Homes), R-1-5
2. Remove the area along 200 E. from “North Ogden Downtown Area” as it is fully developed with large lot single-family homes. Retain the eastern rear portion of the west facing lots as future growth area in North Ogden Downtown Area if residents determine it in their best interest to combine and divide off portions of their existing rear lots.
3. North Ogden Downtown Area: Include undeveloped land west of Patriot Point from 2550 N to Montgomery Farms Subdivision.
- a. Zoning: C-2, R-4, MPC (with mixed use) MPC area will include Commercial on 2550 N.
4. Future Commercial Town Center – Focus on historic aspects to The Cannery and Kirt’s Drive-in. Redevelopment area could include mix of uses, daylighting Cold Creek, and creating a unique gathering place, urban open space, commercial entryway into the city.
- a. Zoning: Future Mixed-Use Zone to permit housing along with walkable commercial
5. Weber County School District owned property changed to Civic/Institutional Use to reflect future school.
- a. Zoning: Civic/Institutional
6. South Town Mixed Use: Include property around 1700 N to 1500 N, west of Washington Boulevard.
- a. Zoning: C-2, R-4, MPC (with mixed use)
7. Potential future Neighborhood Commercial Nodes: Monroe Blvd. & 1700 N., 2600 N. & 1050 E., Canyon Road
- a. Zoning: Future Neighborhood Commercial – Develop wording in the General Plan document that would be permissive of future commercial, but no specific location determined. These areas focus on Major Collector Streets. Encourage the re-use and revitalization of historic buildings to be used in a Commercial context (barns, existing farm structures).
8. Potential future Commercial at Mountain Rd. and 1700 N.
- a. Zoning: Future Neighborhood Commercial
9. Urban Agricultural Protection Area: Reduce the size of the “Potential Conservation Area” based on existing underlying land uses and developed park space which is not expected to change. Focus future potential on ways to preserve remaining open space through clustered subdivisions.
- a. Zoning: RE-20, R-1-10 (with 30% land conservation)
 - b. Density Bonus Calculation Example:
 - i. 10-acre parcel at RE-20 (20,000 sqft lots) = 21 lots
 - ii. 10-acre with 30% land preservation (7-acres remaining after preservation), apply R-10 zone as bonus density (10,000 sqft lots) = 30 lots
 - iii. Determine character standards for preserved space / specific assets to preserve in addition to percentage preserved.

- iv. Revise Residential “R Zones” to require open space preservation in all single-family zones. Review Farmington City Ordinance for step up of zone density bonus based on underlying zoning.
- 10. Potential future Commercial at Fruitland Dr. and 2100 N.
 - a. Zoning: Future Neighborhood Commercial
- 11. Residential Hillside Cluster: Retain underlying zoning but apply a density bonus for open space preservation.
 - a. Zoning: HP-1, HP-2, HP-3, (Open Space Preservation: 25% density bonus for preservation of 25% of open space) or (Open Space Preservation: 50% density bonus for preservation of 30% of open space)
 - b. Density Bonus Calculation Option 1:
 - i. 50-acre parcel at HP-3 (2-acre lots) = 25 lots
 - ii. 50-acre with 25% land reduction (37.5 acres remaining after preservation), apply 25% increase in density to base zone) = 31 lots (overall size of lots becomes 1.2 acres)
 - c. Density Bonus Calculation Option 2:
 - i. 50-acre parcel at HP-3 (2-acre lots) = 25 lots
 - ii. 50-acre with 30% land reduction (35 acres remaining after preservation), apply 50% increase in density to base zone) = 37 lots (overall size of lots becomes 0.94 acres on average)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is asking the General Plan Advisory Committee to review the submitted information and make a motion for recommendation to send this map with any requested changes to Planning Commission for a recommendation, and ultimately to the City Council to act on the General Plan Future Land Use Map.

EXHIBITS

- A. DRAFT 2021 General Plan Future Land Use Map dated 10/21/2021

DRAFT
FUTURE LAND USE MAP

- Potential Conservation Areas

Streets

North Ogden Potential Boundary

Streams/Canals

Future Land Use

Residential Hillside

Residential Low Density
- Residential Medium Density

Parks

Down Town Mixed Use - See Downtown Map

South Town Mixed Use - See Southtown Map

Mixed-Use/Multi-family/Commercial

Civic/Institutional

Proposed Land Use Boundary Adjustments

Twin Home Overlay
- Neighborhood Commercial



NORTH OGDEN CITY

— SETTLED 1851 —

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Date: 10/21/2021

